

Monday, April 1st 1991

Today's Topics:

Sheriff's Deputy Denied Promotion  
Re: Bill Cooper  
Re: Bill Cooper  
Hoagland's Mars  
Sheriff's Deputy Denied Promotion  
Subscription termination  
Re: Statements of accepta  
Re: Bill Cooper  
Re: Bill Cooper  
Fcc Modem Charge  
MODEM TAX  
Mail Problems  
Re: Fcc Modem Charge  
Re: Fcc Modem Charge

---

From: Jim.Speiser@paranet.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Speiser)  
Subject: Sheriff's Deputy Denied Promotion  
Date: 28 Mar 91 07:45:00 GMT

I've just learned that a sheriff's deputy in Tucson, who also happens to be MUFON State Section Director for Pima County, has been denied a promotion within the department due to his active interest in Ufology. Apparently Hard Copy is sending a camera crew to cover the case of Bob Dean, long-time member of the now-defunct APRO and now an investigator for MUFON. Allegedly Dean's lawyer taped a statement from the sheriff, who promoted a supposedly less-qualified deputy instead of Dean, due to Dean's belief in flying saucers.

T'will be interesting to see how Hard Copy covers this one.

Jim

--

Jim Speiser - via FidoNet node 1:104/422  
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User\_Name  
INTERNET: Jim.Speiser@paranet.FIDONET.ORG

---

From: Tyson.Mitchiner@f134.n109.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Tyson Mitchiner)  
Subject: Re: Bill Cooper  
Date: 26 Mar 91 01:38:00 GMT

> that, and I believe in the possibilty of ET life. However I  
> to am a SKEPTIC I do not believe in allowing my mind to be so  
> open that my brains tumble out \_ I may never find them! GRIN  
>  
> DON

(GASP)

If I gather as much information as I can on this subject, my brains  
will.. will.. ex-explode?

You know, I never can understand the "Dont allow too much  
information in or your brain will pop out" concept. Our mind  
supposedly has unlimited storage capacity.

I don't care about skepticism.. I don't care about gullibilism. All  
that seems logical is that since I have a curiosity as to what  
those sightings may be (I will not conclude they are aliens. They  
may be U.S. secret planes, a freak of nature, whatever.) I do not  
have enough information to conclude that those sightings are hoaxes,  
and I do not have enough information to conclude what exactly UFO's  
are (NOTE: \*UNIDENTIFIED\* FLYING OBJECT, not aliens.). So, it would  
be rather illogical of me to conclude anything until I have  
sufficient information to make a conclusion.

Since my mind has unlimited storage capacity (at least there has  
been no real evidence to the contrary), I'll gather as much  
information I can to piece together the puzzle.

Tyson

--

Tyson Mitchiner - via FidoNet node 1:104/422  
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User\_Name  
INTERNET: Tyson.Mitchiner@f134.n109.z1.FIDONET.ORG

-----  
From: Jim.Greenen@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Greenen)  
Subject: Re: Bill Cooper  
Date: 26 Mar 91 14:10:01 GMT

DE> Jim;  
DE>  
DE> Excuse me for jumping in about your message to Rick Moen,  
DE> but I have to state that as one of the old timers here in  
DE> ParaNet, I have "known" Rick for quite some time. Rick can  
DE> NOT be accused of being "close" minded, but he does ask  
DE> questions. That does not make him a bad guy. Checking my

DE> dictionary skeptic was listed as: n. doubt in absence of  
DE> conclusive evidence; and BROTHER does that describe Mr.  
DE> Cooper!  
DE>  
DE> As one who did a two part investigation in Mr. Milton Wm.  
DE> Cooper, I can tell you first hand that Cooper is at the  
DE> forefront of lacking ANY CONCLUSIVE EVIDENCE. As a matter of  
DE> fact, several months ago I used the word CHARLATAN in  
DE> reference to Cooper, ( and I was being nice to boot ) and  
DE> Mr. Moen chided me for the adjective. Skeptic? Yep, Mr.  
DE> Moen is that and he uses it in his origin line. Close  
DE> minded? No I do not agree. I had a sighting myself, and a  
DE> dramatic one at that, and I believe in the possibility of ET  
DE> life. However I to am a SKEPTIC I do not believe in  
DE> allowing my mind to be so open that my brains tumble out \_  
DE> I may never find them! GRIN  
DE>  
DE> DON  
DE>

No problem in jumping in, Don. But didn't I see you on stage with the 4 uninvited guest in Las Vegas and wasn't Uncle Milt one of them? ---GRIN---. Now, If you had a dramatic sighting (and I also had one) wouldn't you have the tendency to throw all skepticism out and look toward the reasons of who, how, what and where questions? I did that many years ago and now I am looking for the answers to those questions.

You mention that you are skeptic but skeptic of what? If you were referring to Mr. Cooper, you have good reason but to the existence of aliens visiting this planet, you should not have any doubt. I have had many discussions with Rick on the BBS and got the feeling that what ever you or anybody said he had a swamp gas answers to your questions or quoted the amazing Randy guy. Maybe Rick has change his mind since reading these echos and now might believe that maybe something might be valid to these storys. I hope so because the real investigation has many unanswered questions.

73's ---Jim---

--

Jim Greenen - via FidoNet node 1:104/422  
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User\_Name  
INTERNET: Jim.Greenen@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG

-----  
  
From: Michael.Corbin@f422.n104.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Michael Corbin)  
Subject: Hoagland's Mars  
Date: 28 Mar 91 20:29:00 GMT

> I have recieved a badly formatted letter from Alan Shawn Feinstein  
> Associates, Cranston RI 02905 telling of a release that explains why the

> Jan 6th NASA briefing was cancelled. The letter tells me that this was  
> quite a revelation, and tries to sell stamps. If anyone knows whats  
> going on, let me know. I'm so cornfused.

I just received a review of copy of "Hoagland's Mars" which I am going to review for ParaNet. I will get you some information in a couple of days. The video is impressive, however I cannot comment on it yet without going further into the review.

Mike

--

Michael Corbin - via FidoNet node 1:104/422  
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User\_Name  
INTERNET: Michael.Corbin@f422.n104.z1.FIDONET.ORG

---

From: Michael.Corbin@f422.n104.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Michael Corbin)  
Subject: Sheriff's Deputy Denied Promotion  
Date: 28 Mar 91 20:29:00 GMT

> I've just learned that a sheriff's deputy in Tucson, who also happens to  
> be MUFON State Section Director for Pima County, has been denied a  
> promotion within the department due to his active interest in Ufology.  
> Apparently Hard Copy is sending a camera crew to cover the case of Bob  
> Dean, long-time member of the now-defunct APRO and now an investigator  
> for MUFON. Allegedly Dean's lawyer taped a statement from the sheriff,  
> who promoted a supposedly less-qualified deputy instead of Dean, due to  
> Dean's belief in flying saucers.

Can you cover it for ParaNet?

Mike

--

Michael Corbin - via FidoNet node 1:104/422  
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User\_Name  
INTERNET: Michael.Corbin@f422.n104.z1.FIDONET.ORG

---

From: Jim.Speiser@f37.n114.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Speiser)  
Subject: Subscription termination  
Date: 28 Mar 91 15:39:00 GMT

> Please terminate my subscription to the Paranet Newsletter.  
> Although I have found some of the postings to be of interest,  
> particularly those of sightings and information thereto,  
> I find the bickering and arguing to be a waste of my time, counter-  
> productive, and uninteresting, to boot.  
> I just don't have the time to go through all that to get to the  
> postings I consider valuable.

Can someone please tell me the name of a non-technical echo I can check into, that DOESN'T feature bickering and arguing? Personally I think there's more bickering on that supposed bastion of gentlemanly discourse, the FIDO SCIENCE echo, than there is here....

Jim

--

Jim Speiser - via FidoNet node 1:104/422  
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User\_Name  
INTERNET: Jim.Speiser@f37.n114.z1.FIDONET.ORG

-----  
From: John.Tender@f112.n129.z1.FIDONET.ORG (John Tender)  
Subject: Re: Statements of accepta  
Date: 28 Mar 91 05:51:50 GMT

->>material with  
->>which you (and you say Jim also) are all too familiar, you  
->>were unable  
->>to supply them. (Jim, if you're there, can you help out  
->>here?)

JS> Golly, wish I could, John, but I can't seem to get a handle on  
JS> what the hell you guys are arguing about. The rhetoric seems to  
JS> be getting piled pretty high here. If you're asking me what  
JS> Shaeffer, Klass, et al have held out as criteria for proof of  
JS> UFO reality, I do have some idea, but the references would be  
JS> mostly personal conversations. Will that do? As I posted here

You found the pony.

I am looking for statements they have committed to print and public distribution; if no single definitive statements are available, then maybe a few relevant citations. If you have some files of personal conversations, I'm interested but I'd rather have "official" statements in their own words.

Such statements would be quite valuable. It would at least show how competent these guys are as scientists (assuming they would actually write their own stuff) as opposed to propagandists.

JS> As to the rest of the argument, I think both you guys ought to  
JS> cool it. I was director of ParaNet at the time Cooper was  
JS> logging on, and it was my decision to keep all of his and John  
JS> Lear's files public, and I commend Rick for doing the same.  
JS> \*My\* reasoning was that it was important for those people who  
JS> had not made up their minds on the issue to be given everything  
JS> they needed in order to do so. I felt confident that Cooper  
JS> would simply hang himself with his own words, but regardless of  
JS> that, its always been my feeling that we have nothing to fear  
JS> from ideas....

I never said Rick or anyone should delete any files. I did say that if we are going to categorize these files, as "good" or "bad" or "Cooper-like" etc., we should have explicitly stated (as opposed to implicitly assumed) ~reasons~ for doing so. I opposed the idea that such file deletions should be made at the whim of a sysop. This is both consistent with and required of a scientific approach to the UFO phenomena.

When Rick, a member of the Bay Area Skeptics and CSICOP, evaded this issue so persistently it merely reinforced a pattern I've seen in skeptics before; using science when it is convenient, and ignoring it otherwise.

... from the purlieus of Pittsburgh

--

John Tender - via FidoNet node 1:104/422  
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User\_Name  
INTERNET: John.Tender@f112.n129.z1.FIDONET.ORG

-----  
From: Don.Ecker@f3.n1012.z9.FIDONET.ORG (Don Ecker)  
Subject: Re: Bill Cooper  
Date: 29 Mar 91 04:41:00 GMT

I said:

> > that, and I believe in the possibilty of ET life. However I  
> > to am a SKEPTIC I do not believe in allowing my mind to be so  
> > open that my brains tumble out \_ I may never find them! GRIN

What I meant was - - - I do not except just anything I hear until such time as I have the time to conduct my own research into the question. I DID NOT MEAN THAT I DISBELIEVE EVERYTHING I HEAR, BUT AS MUCH AS I HATE TO SAY IT, THE WILDER CLAIMS BY NECESSITY MUST BE RESEARCHED TO THE Nth DEGREE. For example, Milty Coopers claim now that the "aliens" are demons, the Government is

going to round up all the abductees and put them into concentration camps, and other assorted Bull of that type.

Tyson said:

- > (GASP)
- >
- > If I gather as much information as I can on this
- > subject, my brains will.. will.. ex-explode?
- >
- > much information in or your brain will pop out"
- > concept.
- > Our mind supposedly has unlimited storage capacity.

Yea Tyson, that may be, but still, that does not mean that you don't question, and research. Do you believe EVERYTHING you hear? If so, I got this really GREAT car that I am selling, and BOY\* \* \* can YOU BUY it CHEAP. You send me a check, I send you the papers-----OK?

- > I don't care about skepticism.. I don't care about
- > gullibilism. All that seems logical is that since I
- > have a curiosity as to what those sightings may be (I
- > will not conclude they are aliens. They may be U.S.
- > secret planes, a freak of nature, whatever.) I do not
- > have enough information to conclude that those
- > sightings are hoaxes, and I do not have enough
- > information to conclude what exactly UFO's are (NOTE:
- > \*UNIDENTIFIED\* FLYING OBJECT, not aliens.). So, it
- > would be rather illogical of me to conclude anything
- > until I have sufficient information to make a
- > conclusion.

Thats right, so just where do we disagree?

- > Since my mind has unlimited storage capacity (at least
- > there has been no real evidence to the contrary), I'll
- > gather as much information I can to piece together the
- > puzzle.
- >

And to think I thought I was speaking in a vacuum.

Don

--

Don Ecker - via FidoNet node 1:104/422

UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User\_Name

INTERNET: Don.Ecker@f3.n1012.z9.FIDONET.ORG

-----  
From: Don.Ecker@f3.n1012.z9.FIDONET.ORG (Don Ecker)  
Subject: Re: Bill Cooper  
Date: 29 Mar 91 04:53:00 GMT

Jim Greenen said:

- > No problem in jumping in, Don. But didn't I see you on
- > stage with the 4 uninvited guest in Las Vegas and
- > wasn't Uncle Milt one of them? ---GRIN---

June of 1989. Yep, John Lear, then the MUFON State Director hosted the MUFON Conference, and he invited me to speak on my research involving mutilations. What does that have to do with the above?

- > Now, If you had a dramatic sighting (and I also had one)
- > wouldn't you have the tendency to throw all skepticism
- > out and look toward the reasons of who, how, what and
- > where questions?

No. I would first attempt to see if there was an explanation in prosaic terms. Even though I had a sighting that has never been explained, I am too aware of other peoples sightings that WERE explained.

- > You mention that you are skeptic but skeptic of
- > what? If you were refering to Mr. Cooper, you have
- > good reason but to the existence of aliens visiting
- > this planet, you should not have any doubt.

Ah ha, but that is it. We do not KNOW that aliens are visiting here. I may suspect, I may "feel it" but I do not know, and I would venture a guess that no one I know, TRULY knows that aliens are here. What we have at this point is a strong working hypothesis that this is the case. However, if you KNOW, and CAN PROVE IT, you are probably on your way to your first million. The catch is, PROVE IT.

What started this conversation however, if I recall, is the fact that although Moen is a skeptic, he had Cooper Crap on his board. Well, the First Admendment is still in effect, regardless of what Cooper claims is going on and Moen is the Sysop of his BBS, and he has not censored it, so what was it that got you all fired up?

Don

--

Don Ecker - via FidoNet node 1:104/422  
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User\_Name



INTERNET: Don.Ecker@f3.n1012.z9.FIDONET.ORG

-----  
From: Michael.Corbin@f422.n104.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Michael Corbin)  
Subject: Fcc Modem Charge  
Date: 29 Mar 91 19:19:00 GMT

- \* Forwarded from "Communications Echo"
- \* Originally from Philip Kirschner
- \* Originally dated 03-28-91 03:48

Next Again  
Msg # 8 of 9 Date: Fri 3-22-91, 4:37 pm  
From: SYSOP Read: 37 times

Subject: MODEM TAX

A new regulation that the FCC is quietly working on will directly affect you as the user of a computer and modem. The FCC proposes that users of modems should pay extra charges for use of the public telephone network which carry their data. In addition, computer network services such as Compu Serv, Tymnet, & Telenet would also be charged as much as \$6.00 per hour per user for use of the public telephone network. These charges would very likely be passed on to the subscribers. The money is to be collected and given to the telephone company in an effort to raise funds lost to deregulation. Jim Eason of KGO newstalk radio (San Francisco, Ca) commented on the proposal during his afternoon radio program during which, he said he learned of the new regulation in an article in the New York Times. Jim took the time to gather the addresses which are given below.

What you should do: First, take the time to download this message and the letter which follows. Next find three or more other BBS systems which are not carrying this message and upload this text. Finally, print three copies of the letter which follows (or write your own) and send a signed copy to the three addresses. It is important that you act now. The bureaucrats already have it in there mind that modem users should subsidize the phone company and are now listening to public comment. Please stand up and make it clear that we will not stand for any government restriction on the free exchange of information.

The three addresses to write to: (a letter to send follows)

Chairman of the FCC  
1919 M Street N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Chairman, Senate Communication Subcommittee  
SH-227 Hart Building  
Washington, D.C. 20510

Chairman, House Telecommunication Subcommittee  
B-331 Rayburn Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Sir,

Please allow me to express my displeasure with the FCC proposal which would authorize a surcharge for the use of modems on the -- more -- telephone network. This regulation is nothing less than an attempt to restrict the free exchange of information among the growing number of computer users. Calls placed using modems require no special telephone company equipment, and users of modems pay the phone company for use of the network in the form of a monthly bill. In short, a modem call is the same as a voice call and therefore should not be subject to any additional regulation.

| Or words to that effect |

Again Reply Prev Next Quit  
Read the next message Next

--

Michael Corbin - via FidoNet node 1:104/422  
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User\_Name  
INTERNET: Michael.Corbin@f422.n104.z1.FIDONET.ORG

-----

From: Clark.Matthews@paranet.FIDONET.ORG (Clark Matthews)  
Subject: Mail Problems  
Date: 30 Mar 91 07:51:00 GMT

Hi Elizabeth, and thank you for the speedy response re:Nahani Park.

Unfortunately, my mail tossing program seems to have a major bug -- all I could decypher from your response was your name, "Nahani", some odd words & fragments, and a tantalizing allusion to headless prospectors.

Would you be kind enough to repost your response? I have pitched Zmail in favor of Imail and am reasonably certain that I can read your reply without a program editor this time!

Many thanks!

Best,  
Clark

--

Clark Matthews - via FidoNet node 1:104/422  
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User\_Name  
INTERNET: Clark.Matthews@paranet.FIDONET.ORG

-----  
From: Jim.Shaffer@f4.n1012.z9.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Shaffer)  
Subject: Re: Fcc Modem Charge  
Date: 1 Apr 91 08:12:00 GMT

Hey, wait a minute!

Not only have I heard of this proposed tax about a year ago (and subsequently, after starting a big argument about it on another net, found out that it was phony), THIS IS THE \*EXACT\* ARTICLE I READ BACK THEN!

I agree that if such a suggestion is ever made, we must act to crush it as fast as it physically possible, but I doubt that it's actually being considered now. If this weren't the same message I read previously, I might be worried. So if there's really something going on, somebody better do something more than paste ancient messages into his editor!

--  
Jim Shaffer - via FidoNet node 1:104/422  
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User\_Name  
INTERNET: Jim.Shaffer@f4.n1012.z9.FIDONET.ORG

-----  
From: Jim.Shaffer@f4.n1012.z9.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Shaffer)  
Subject: Re: Fcc Modem Charge  
Date: 1 Apr 91 08:17:00 GMT

Clark,

I hear that in New York, you have to pay extra to use CompuServe. Not only that, but CIS has to bill that part! If I were running the thing, I'd have told them where to go!

Also, our esteemed Governor Casey wants to tax long-distance phone calls, as well as cable TV. Don't you hate it when high technology is taken over by people who in all likelihood don't even understand the basic principles of its operation?!

Anyway, see my recent reply to Mike's message before you bomb FCC HQ or anything.

--  
Jim Shaffer - via FidoNet node 1:104/422  
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User\_Name  
INTERNET: Jim.Shaffer@f4.n1012.z9.FIDONET.ORG

\*\*\*\*\*To have your comments in the next issue, send electronic mail to\*\*\*\*\*  
'infopara' at the following address:

UUCP {ncar,isis,boulder}!scicom!infopara  
DOMAIN infopara@scicom.alphacdc.com  
ADMIN Address infopara-request@scicom.alphacdc.com  
{ncar,isis,boulder}!scicom!infopara-request

\*\*\*\*\*The\*\*End\*\*of\*\*Info-ParaNet\*\*Newsletter\*\*\*\*\*